

REMARKS

Applicant submits that the present amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated March 31, 2008 and, thus, the application is in condition for allowance.

By this reply, no claims are amended. Claims 1-12 and 14-20 remain pending. Of these, claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 18, and 20 are independent. An expedited review and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Contractor (US Pub. No. 2002/0085687). It is asserted that Contractor discloses a method and network element with all of the limitations of the present invention as recited in the claims. Applicant respectively traverses.

Contractor cannot anticipate the present invention as recited in the pending claims because all of the elements are not disclosed. For example, Contractor does not disclose a method network element that obtaining location information for a caller during establishment of a call to a called party; converting the location information to voice information; announcing the voice information to the called party; and forming a connection between the called party and a calling party. Thus, Contractor cannot anticipate the present invention as recited in the pending claims.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Saha (US Pat. No. 6,198,935). It is asserted that Contractor teaches substantially the same invention as in the present claims but for obtaining the location information from a Gateway Mobile Location Center (GMLC). It is further asserted that Saha cures this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present claim as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Contractor nor Saha, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references as asserted by the examiner. Contractor fails for the reasons set forth above. Saha does not cure the defects. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine Contractor and Saha, *arguendo*, the combination would fail to obviate the present as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Contractor in view of Park (US Pat. No. 6,434,9126). It is asserted that Contractor teaches substantially the same invention as in the present claims but for obtaining the name information using Calling Name Address Presentation (CNAP). It is further asserted that Park cures this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present claim as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Contractor nor Park, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references as asserted by the examiner. Contractor fails for the reasons set forth above. Park does not cure the defects. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine Contractor and Park, *arguendo*, the combination would fail to obviate the present as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 6, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brisebois (US Pat. No. 6,310,944) in view of Contractor. It is asserted that Brisebois teaches substantially the same invention as in the present claims but for

converting the location information to voice information, and announcing the voice information. It is further asserted that Contractor cures this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present claim as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Brisebois nor Contractor, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references as asserted by the examiner. Brisebois fails for the reasons set forth above with respect to Contractor. The combination with Contractor does not cure the defects. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine Brisebois and Contractor, *arguendo*, the combination would fail to obviate the present as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brisebois and Contractor in view of Saha (US Pat. No. 6,198,935). It is asserted that Contractor teaches substantially the same invention as in the present claims but for obtaining the location information from a Gateway Mobile Location Center (GMLC). It is further asserted that Saha cures this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present claim as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Brisebois nor Contractor nor Saha, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references as asserted by the examiner. Brisebois fails for the reasons set forth above with respect to Contractor. The combination with Contractor does not cure the defects. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine Brisebois and Contractor and Saha,

arguendo, the combination would fail to obviate the present as recited in the pending claims.

Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brisebois and Contractor in view of Park (US Pat. No. 6,434,126). It is asserted that Contractor teaches substantially the same invention as in the present claims but for obtaining the name information using Calling Name Address Presentation (CNAP). It is further asserted that Park cures this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present claim as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Brisebois nor Contractor nor Park, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references as asserted by the examiner. Brisebois fails for the reasons set forth above with respect to Contractor. The combination with Contractor does not cure the defects. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine Brisebois and Contractor and Park, *arguendo*, the combination would fail to obviate the present as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 11, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benco (US Pat. No. 6,839,022) in view of Contractor. It is asserted that Benco teaches substantially the same invention as in the present claims but for converting the location information into a voice announcement. It is further asserted that Contractor cures this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present claim as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Benco nor Contractor, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references as asserted by the examiner. Benco fails for the reasons set forth above with respect to Contractor. The combination with Contractor does not cure the defects. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine Benco and Contractor, *arguendo*, the combination would fail to obviate the present as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benco and Contractor in view of Saha. It is asserted that Benco teaches substantially the same invention as in the present claims but for the network element being a Gateway Mobile Location Center (GMLC). It is further asserted that Saha cures this deficiency and thus the combination would render the present claim as obvious. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Neither Benco nor Contractor nor Saha, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, disclose or fairly suggest the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Nor would it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the references as asserted by the examiner. Benco fails for the reasons set forth above with respect to Contractor. The combination with Contractor and Saha does not cure the defects. Thus, even if there was motivation to combine Benco and Contractor and Saha, *arguendo*, the combination would fail to obviate the present as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

None of the other art of record, cited but not relied upon, alone or in combination, recite, teach or fairly suggest inventions as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed to proceed to issue.

A THREE (3) month extension of time is hereby requested to enter this amendment. If any other fees are associated with the entering and consideration of this amendment, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account 50-2882.

Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner to present more evidence of the unique attributes of the present invention in person. As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 30 September 2008

/Fariborz Moazzam, Reg. No. 53,339/
Fariborz Moazzam
Reg. No. 53,339
Cust. No. 39,013

MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC
7601 Lewinsville Road, Suite 304
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 442-9480 (direct)
(703) 991-5978 (fax)